

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
)
Shunpei Yamazaki et al.)
)
Serial No.: 09/500,897)
)
Filed: February 9, 2000)
)
For: Electronic View Finder Utilizing An)
Organic Electroluminescence Display)
)
Examiner: Justin Misleh)
)
Art Unit: 2622)
)
Confirmation No.: 3195)

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE J (AFTER FINAL)

Applicants have the following response to the Final Rejection of January 28, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103:

- (a) Claims 1, 3, 32-35 and 48-53 are rejected as being unpatentable over Takahara (U.S. 6,219,113) in view of Tang et al. (U.S. 5,550,066) in further view of Nishiguchi (U.S. 6,046,787).
- (b) Claims 36-41, 54-59 are rejected as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Tang et al. in view of Hamada (U.S. 6,114,715) and further in view of Nishiguchi.
- (c) Claims 42-47 and 60-65 are rejected as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Tang et al. in view of Zavracky et al. in further view of Hamada, in even further view of Nishiguchi.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, as previously explained, independent Claims 1, 36, and 42 are directed to a camera and recite in the body of the claim the features of a body of the camera, and an electroluminescence display device attached to the body of the camera. Independent Claims 48, 54, and 60 are directed to a camera and recite in the body of the claim, a body of the camera and a view finder including an electroluminescence display device attached to the body of the camera.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner now cites Takahara as disclosing a camera having a view finder with an electroluminescence display device but admits that Takahara does not disclose the construction or internal components of the electroluminescence display device.

The Examiner then cites a combination of Tang and Nishiguchi. However, even if these references were properly combinable (which Applicants do not admit), such a combination (with Takahara) still fails to achieve or make obvious the claimed invention which is directed to a camera and includes the features of a camera body and an electroluminescence display device attached to the body or a view finder including an electroluminescence display device attached to the body.

For example, in the Final Rejection, the Examiner continues to contend that Tang discloses a planarizing film 52 and cites col. 7, lines 17-19 in Tang in support of his contention. However, Tang merely teaches in column 7, lines 17-19 that “an insulating layer, preferably silicon dioxide, 52 is applied over the entire surface of the device.” Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that Tang does not teach a planarizing film.¹

Applicants previously raised this point in their last response (filed November 7, 2007) to the Examiner’s Office Action, *but the Examiner has not addressed this point in the Final Rejection*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this Final Rejection and issue a

¹ The Examiner’s Office Notice is irrelevant with regard to this claim feature. The issue is not whether

new action addressing this point.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 36, 42, 48, 54 and 60 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: April 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568

planarizing films comprising a resin are known, it is whether such a feature is disclosed or suggested in Tang. As explained herein, this feature is not disclosed or suggested in Tang.